



3627 *en*

Application No. 10/067,073
Filing Date: 02/04/2002
First Name Inventor: Cindy A. Burklow
Art Unit: 3627
Examiner: Gerald J. O'Connor
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Patent Officer,

Thank you for your comments on our patent application. After reading your comments about our invention, we have to disagree with you and argue that our invention is innovative. Rather than a common trade, we have developed our unique customizing technique out of market need to satisfy our customers' demand. This has nothing to do with the customizing of motor oil as discussed in the letter with McHenry. We work in the food industry, which is a totally different trade and industry. Our invention of customizing the sweeteners is not an obvious trade, because only the current technologies have made it possible to customize the customers' need for customized sweeteners in real time and in a costly-effective fashion.

We strongly believe that our invention is unique and innovative, because of following reasons:

First, if the invention is so obvious, then why is there no one doing it right now? To date, there is no manufacturer that is using the customizing technique that we have developed to sell customized sweeteners to customers as proposed by us. Furthermore, there is no one in the sweetener industry even making an attempt to sell online customized sweeteners to either consumers or manufacturers. On the contrary, McHenry's invention is obvious, because he is selling pre-made oil products not a process of selling customized products to meet customers' needs.

Second, our invention was compared to totally different & unrelated products in vastly different industries. Since our product deals with the process of customizing sweeteners not motor oil, then McHenry's patent should have no impact on our patent since it would affect neither him nor his industry if we obtain the patent for the sweetener industry. For example, like Dell selling online customized computers did not affect McHenry's patent vice versa McHenry should not affect our patent.

Third, McHenry just got his patent in Feb 2002, the same month that we applied so we did not have access to that information.

Fourth, the selling of sweeteners of non-customizing is not the essence of our invention. Therefore, discountcoffee.com selling a pre-made off-the-shelf sweetener online does not affect the essence of our invention, which is a process of customizing sweeteners online not selling pre-made sweeteners through an online store.

Fifth, our process is not for selling the premade-sweetener, but it is customizing in real-time for both consumers and manufacturers.

Finally, in retrospective, when you take any idea for all patents presented and reflect back on it, they all appear obvious if you take all industries into consideration, then no one would have a patent.

Please reconsider our patent for the sweetener industry and allow us to pursue our invention and meet our customers' needs.

Sincerely,



Cindy A. Burklow, MBA

Chifu Huang, PhD, MS, MBA

